

REMARKS**I. Status of the Application**

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. In the August 21, 2007 office action, the Examiner:

- A. Objected to claims 1, 18 and 19 because of various informalities;
- B. Rejected claims 1 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,084,472 to Niimi;
- C. Rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niimi in view of US 6,219,815 to DesJardins et al;
- D. Objected to claims 2-16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; and
- E. Allowed claims 19-23.

The allowance of claims 19-23 is gratefully acknowledged. In this response, applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 18 and 19. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

II. The Objection to Claims 1, 18 and 19 Should be Withdrawn

In the August 21, 2007 Office action, the examiner objected to claims 1, 18 and 19 because of various informalities. Claims 1, 18 and 19 have been amended to overcome the examiner objections. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner's objection to claims 1, 18 and 19 should be withdrawn.

III. The Rejection of Claims 1, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Should be Withdrawn

In the August 21, 2007 Office action, the examiner rejected claims 1, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to include the limitation previously found in allowable claim 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 18 should be withdrawn.

Claim 17 depends from and incorporates all the limitations of allowable claim 1. Accordingly, claim 17 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and the examiner's rejection of claim 17 should also be withdrawn.

IV. The Objection to Claims 2-16 Should be Withdrawn

In the August 21, 2007 Office action, the examiner objected to claims 2-16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that such claims would be allowable if re-written in independent form. As set forth above, the limitations of claim 2 are now found in claim 1, and claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 7 and 12 have been re-written in independent form and should therefore be allowable. Furthermore, claims 3-6, 8-11 and 13-16 depend from and incorporate all the limitations of one of allowable independent claims 1, 7 or 12. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner's objection to claims 2-16 should be withdrawn.

Applicant has enclosed a check in the amount of \$420.00 in payment of the additional independent claims 7 and 12 (2 additional independent claims in excess of three).

V. Applicant Has Enclosed a Certified Copy of the Priority Document

The present application claims priority from priority document DE 10255351.3. A certified copy of the priority document is enclosed with this response.

VI. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,



November 21, 2007

Russell E. Fowler II
Attorney for Applicants
Attorney Registration No. 43,615
Maginot Moore & Beck
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109
Telephone: (317) 638-2922